

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

5

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/885,705	06/20/2001	Akram Boughannam	6169-243	4240

40987 7590 07/28/2004

AKERMAN SENTERFITT
P. O. BOX 3188
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/885,705

Applicant(s)

BOUGHANNAM, AKRAM

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on 6/20/2001.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. Claims 1-21 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, 11, 14, and 16 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The drawings filed on 6/20/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1-6 are objected to because of the following informalities: "an document" in claim 1, line 12. This better reads "a document". Appropriate correction is required.
5. Claims 16-21 are objected to because of the following informalities: "an document" in claim 16, line 14. This better reads "a document". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

Art Unit: 2178

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anthony et al, hereinafter Anthony (US Pub.# 2003/0069908 A1, 4/10/2003, provisional filed on 1/27/2000).

Regarding independent claim 11, Anthony discloses translating a first XML document into a catalog model using a translator—*state machine modeling tool*--. The model is made up of class names in squares, instances of classes in circles—*state chart names, and transition data*—, solid, and dotted arrow lines—*composite state actions* (0366-0367, fig.20).

Moreover, Anthony discloses translating the model into a second XML document (0365-0367, fig. 20). Thereby, parsing and translating classes, instances, and arrows into the second XML document—*parsing state actions into component state actions, formatting said state chart data and component state actions according to selected markup language*.

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 11, Anthony teaches the translation of a first XML document model into a second XML document (0366-0367, fig.20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 16-18, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthony, in view of Daugherty et al, hereinafter Daugherty (US Pub. #2002/0016828 A1, 2/7/2002, filed on 12/3/1998).

Regarding independent claim 1, Anthony discloses using a model viewer's interface for viewing items belonging to a given concept--*state data corresponding to a state chart diagram*-- (0062-0063, fig.3).

Moreover, Anthony teaches translating a first document written in an XML format to a second XML format, such as document in fig.19, which has a tag describing the version—“<?xml version=”1.0?>” (0353-0356, 0366).Anthony fails to explicitly disclose *generating header and footer data in accordance with a selected markup*. However, Daugherty teaches an XML file describing a provider header, and footer (0045). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anthony, and Daugherty, because Daugherty teaches above XML descriptions for maximizing the cacheability of a web page stock data. Thus, enabling a user to quickly retrieve the web page.

Moreover, Anthony teaches the translation —*retrieval* to translate--by a system of classes names as squares, and instances of a class as circles--*state name and state transition data*-- in a clothing model (0365-03667, fig.20).

Moreover, Anthony teaches the translation of a first XML document model into a second XML document—*formatting and saving retrieved state name and transition according to XML* (0366-0367, fig.20).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Anthony teaches the translation of a first XML document into a catalog model. The into a second XML document (0366-0367, fig.20).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Anthony teaches the translation of a first XML document model into a second XML document (0366-0367, fig.20).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 3, Anthony teaches a DTD defining structure of an XML document (0355-0363).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 5, Anthony teaches the translation of a first XML document model into a second XML document using a second DTD (0364-0367, fig.20).

Claims 16-18, and 20-21 are directed towards a program for performing the steps found in claims 1-3, and 5-6 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

10. Claims 4, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthony, in view of Daugherty, and further in view of “Understanding UML The Developer’s Guide with a Web-Based Application in Java”, Harmon et al, hereinafter UML, Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, Inc., 1998, pp.214-253.

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Anthony discloses generating a model of a first XML document (0365-0367, and fig.20). Anthony fails to explicitly disclose *said state*

Art Unit: 2178

chart diagram is a unified modeling (UML) state chart. However, UML teaches the creation of state diagrams using UML (page 222-224, fig. 12.1, 12.3-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anthony, Daugherty, and UML, because UML discloses using state diagrams for specifically showing how objects change state as messages are received and processed (page 215, lines 7-12). Thus enabling a user to quickly identify a specific state of an XML document.

Claim 19 is directed towards a program for performing the steps found in claim 4, and therefore is similarly rejected.

11. Claims 7-8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthony, in view of “Laura Lemay’s Web Workshop JavaScript”, Lemay et al, hereinafter Javascript, Sams, 1996, pp. 7-9.

Regarding independent claim 7, Anthony discloses generating a model of a first XML document—*generating state chart data*—using a translator for translating the model into a second XML document—*formatting state chart data according to a selected markup language* (0365-0367, and fig. 20). Anthony fails to explicitly disclose *an add-in script for formatting said state chart data*. However, Javascript teaches the combining a Javascript program with HTML for performing certain functions (page 6, lines 9-page 7, line 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anthony, and Javascript,

Art Unit: 2178

because Javascript discloses using a relaxed program environment, which makes it easier on the programmer writing the program (page 7, lines 4-17).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 7, Anthony teaches the translation of a first XML document model into a second XML document (0366-0367, fig.20).

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 8, Anthony teaches a DTD defining structure of the translated or formatted XML document (0355-0363).

12. Claims 9, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthony, in view of Javascript, and further in view of UML.

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 8, Anthony discloses generating a model of a first XML document (0365-0367, and fig.20). Anthony fails to explicitly disclose *said generated state chart diagram is a unified modeling (UML) state chart data*. However, UML teaches the creation of state diagrams using UML (page222-224, fig.12.1, 12.3-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anthony, Javascript, and UML, because UML discloses using state diagrams for specifically showing how objects change state as messages are received and processed (page 215, lines 7-12). Thus enabling a user to quickly identify a specific state of an XML document.

Regarding independent claim 14, Anthony discloses generating a model of a first XML document using a modeling system (0365-0367, and fig.20). Anthony fails to explicitly disclose

Art Unit: 2178

said modeling tool producing a unified modeling (UML) specified state chart diagrams.

However, UML teaches the creation of state diagrams using UML (page 222-224, fig. 12.1, 12.3-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anthony, and UML, because UML discloses using state diagrams for specifically showing how objects change state as messages are received and processed (page 215, lines 7-12). Thus enabling a user to quickly identify a specific state of an XML document.

Moreover, Anthony fails to explicitly disclose *an add-in script defining markup representations of said UML specified state chart diagrams*. However, Javascript teaches the combining a Javascript program with HTML for performing certain functions (page 6, lines 9-page 7, line 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anthony, and Javascript, because Javascript discloses using a relaxed program environment, which makes it easier on the programmer writing the program (page 7, lines 4-17).

Furthermore, Anthony fails to explicitly disclose *a state machine run-time engine executing said markup language representations*. However, Javascript teaches using browser for including Javascript objects in an HTML web page (page 6-page 7, lines 3, 18-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anthony, and Javascript, because Javascript discloses using a relaxed program environment, which makes it easier on the programmer writing the program (page 7, lines 4-17).

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 14, Anthony discloses generating a model of a first XML document into a second XML document (0365-0367, and fig. 20). Anthony fails

Art Unit: 2178

to explicitly disclose *said markup language representations are XML representation of said UML specified state chart diagrams*. However, UML teaches the creation of state diagrams using UML (page222-224, fig.12.1, 12.3-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anthony, Javascript, and UML, because UML discloses using state diagrams for specifically showing how objects change state as messages are received and processed (page 215, lines 7-12). Thus enabling a user to quickly identify a specific state of an XML document.

13. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthony, in view of UML.

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 11, Anthony discloses generating a model of a first XML document using a modeling system (0365-0367, and fig.20). Anthony fails to explicitly disclose *said generated state chart diagram is a unified modeling (UML) specified state chart diagram*. However, UML teaches the creation of state diagrams using UML (page222-224, fig.12.1, 12.3-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anthony, and UML, because UML discloses using state diagrams for specifically showing how objects change state as messages are received and processed (page 215, lines 7-12). Thus enabling a user to quickly identify a specific state of an XML document.

Art Unit: 2178

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ballantyne et al. (Pat. # 6,687,873), and Lindberg et al. (Pat. # 2002/0143800).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5543**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- **(703) 703-872-9306**, (for **all** Formal communications intended for entry)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Application/Control Number: 09/885,705

Art Unit: 2178

Page 11

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cesar B Paula". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Cesar" and last name "Paula" clearly distinguishable.

CESAR B PAULA

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2178

7/26/04